



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/052,039	01/17/2002	Shishir Pardikar	2940	1257

7590

07/20/2005

LAW OFFICES OF ALBERT S. MICHALIK, PLLC
704 228 AVENUE NE
SUITE 193
SAMMAMISH, WA 98074

EXAMINER

SERRAO, RANODHI N

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2141

DATE MAILED: 07/20/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/052,039

Applicant(s)

PARDIKAR ET AL.

Examiner

Ranodhi Serrao

Art Unit

2141

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 June 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-41 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 January 2002 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-41 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
2. Applicant argued in substance the amended claims 1, 12, 14, 16, 19, 20, 25, 28, 33, and 36-41. The new grounds teach these and the added features. (See below).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claim 1 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by French (6,654,794). French teaches a method comprising: receiving at an I/O manager an I/O request initiated from an application program directed to a file on a WebDAV server (col. 4, line 58-col. 5, line 19); directing the I/O request to a WebDAV redirector communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled (col. 4, lines 20-41 and col. 5, lines 42-57), and if so, requesting a file system to create the file (col. 6, lines 21-34), downloading the file to a local cache of the file system (col. 14, table II), and returning a file handle corresponding to the file in the local cache to the application program (col. 4, line 66-col. 5, line 19); providing access to the

Art Unit: 2141

file in the local cache of the file system via the file handle (col. 5, lines 42-57); and receiving a request to close the file via the file handle, and when received, uploading the file from the local cache of the file system to the WebDAV server (col. 8, table I).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-11, and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serlet et al. (6,842,770) and French (6,654,794).

7. As per claim 1, Serlet et al. teaches returning a file handle corresponding to the file in the local cache to the application program (see Serlet et al., col. 11, lines 24-49); and receiving a request to close the file via the file handle, and when received, uploading the file from the local cache of the file system to the WebDAV server (see Serlet et al., col. 12, lines 45-54). However, Serlet et al. fails to teach a method comprising: receiving at an I/O manager an I/O request initiated from an application program directed to a file on a WebDAV server; directing the I/O request to a WebDAV redirector communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled, and if so, requesting a file system to create the file, downloading the file to a local cache of the file system and providing access to the file in the local cache of the file system via the file handle. French teaches a method comprising: receiving at

Art Unit: 2141

an I/O manager an I/O request initiated from an application program directed to a file on a WebDAV server (col. 4, line 58-col. 5, line 19); directing the I/O request to a WebDAV redirector communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled (col. 4, lines 20-41 and col. 5, lines 42-57), and if so, requesting a file system to create the file (col. 6, lines 21-34), downloading the file to a local cache of the file system (col. 14, table II); and providing access to the file in the local cache of the file system via the file handle (col. 5, lines 42-57). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Serlet et al. to a method comprising: receiving at an I/O manager an I/O request initiated from an application program directed to a file on a WebDAV server; directing the I/O request to a WebDAV redirector communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled, and if so, requesting a file system to create the file, downloading the file to a local cache of the file system and providing access to the file in the local cache of the file system via the file handle in order to provide a client with an improved network file system driver for accessing a remote resource maintained by a server in communication with the client via a data network (see French, col. 2, lines 1-7).

8. As per claims 2-11, and 15, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 1 stands as the motivation to further combine Serlet et al. and French.

9. As per claim 2, Serlet et al. and French teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but French fails to teach receiving an I/O request initiated from an application program comprises, receiving a Universal Resource Identifier corresponding to a file on the WebDAV server. However, Serlet et al. teaches receiving an I/O request initiated

Art Unit: 2141

from an application program comprises, receiving a Universal Resource Identifier corresponding to a file on the WebDAV server (column 9, lines 38-53).

10. As per claim 3, Serlet et al. and French teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but French fails to teach wherein receiving an I/O request initiated from an application program comprises, receiving a filename and an identifier previously mapped to a share on the WebDAV server. However, Serlet et al. teaches wherein receiving an I/O request initiated from an application program comprises, receiving a filename and an identifier previously mapped to a share on the WebDAV server (column 9, lines 54-63).

11. As per claim 4, Serlet et al. and French teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but French fails to teach a method of communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled, comprises, issuing an HTTP OPTIONS request, and evaluating a response therefrom. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method of communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled, comprises, issuing an HTTP OPTIONS request, and evaluating a response therefrom (column 6, line 65-column 7, line 34: wherein the request is an options request since it can be a command to write file, rename file, rename directory, etc.).

12. As per claim 5, Serlet et al. and French teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but French fails to teach a method of communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled, comprises, issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to share on the WebDAV server, and evaluating a

Art Unit: 2141

response therefrom. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method of communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled, comprises, issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to share on the WebDAV server, and evaluating a response therefrom (column 11, lines 24-49).

13. As per claim 6, Serlet et al. and French teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 5, but French fails to teach a method wherein the WebDAV server returns property information in response to the WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to the share and further comprising, maintaining the property information in a local data structure. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method wherein the WebDAV server returns property information in response to the WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to the share and further comprising, maintaining the property information in a local data structure (column 8, line 66-column 9, line 22; column 11, lines 50-65).

14. As per claim 7, Serlet et al. and French teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but French fails to teach a method of communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled, comprises, issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to on the WeDDAV server, and evaluating a response therefrom. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method of communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled, comprises, issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to on the WeDDAV server, and evaluating a response therefrom (column 11, lines 24-49).

15. As per claim 8, Serlet et al. and French teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 7, but French fails to teach a method wherein the WebDAV server returns

property information in response to the WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to the file, and further comprising, maintaining the property information in a local data structure. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method wherein the WebDAV server returns property information in response to the WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to the file, and further comprising, maintaining the property information in a local data structure (column 8, line 66-column 9, line 22; column 11, lines 50-65).

16. As per claim 9, Serlet et al. and French teach the above mentioned limitations of claim 1, but French fails to teach a method wherein communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled comprises: issuing an HTTP OPTIONS request, evaluating a corresponding response, and determining that the server a WebDAV server; issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to a share on the WebDAV server, evaluating a corresponding response, and determining that the share exists on the WebDAV server, the response including share property information; and issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to the file, evaluating a corresponding response, and determining that the file exists, the response including file property information. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method wherein communicating with the WebDAV server to determine whether the request can be handled comprises: issuing an HTTP OPTIONS request, evaluating a corresponding response, and determining that the server a WebDAV server (column 6, line 65-column 7, line 34: wherein the request in an options request since it can be a command to write file, rename file, rename directory, etc.); issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to a share on the WebDAV server, evaluating a corresponding response, and determining

Art Unit: 2141

that the share exists on the WebDAV server, the response including share property information; and issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to the file, evaluating a corresponding response, and determining that the file exists, the response including file property information (column 11, lines 24-49).

17. As per claim 10, Serlet et al. and French teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 9, but French fails to teach a method of maintaining the share property information and the file property information in at least one local data structure.

However, Serlet et al. teaches a method of maintaining the share property information and the file property information in at least one local data structure (column 8, line 66-column 9, line 22; column 11, lines 50-65).

18. As per claim 11, Serlet et al. and French teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 9, but French fails to teach a method of communicating with the WebDAV server indicates that the request can be handled, and further comprising, communicating with at least one other local component to indicate that at least this request can be handled. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method of communicating with the WebDAV server indicates that the request can be handled, and further comprising, communicating with at least one other local component to indicate that at least this request can be handled (column 5, lines 20-52).

19. As per claim 15, Serlet et al. and French teach the above mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 9, but French fails to teach a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method claim 1. However, Serlet et

Art Unit: 2141

al. teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method claim 1 (column 2, line 51-column 3, line 19).

20. Claims 12-14, and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serlet et al. (6,842,770) and French (6,654,794) as applied to claims 1 and 16 above, and further in view of Prust (6,714,968).

21. As per claim 12, Serlet et al. and French teach the mentioned limitations of claim 1 above, but fail to teach determining that the file is encrypted on the WebDAV server, and wherein downloading the file to a local cache comprises, communicating with the file system to create an image of the file in the local cache that is also encrypted. Prust teaches determining that the file is encrypted on the WebDAV server, and wherein downloading the file to a local cache comprises, communicating with the file system to create an image of the file in the local cache that is also encrypted (see Prust, column 7, lines 39-55: wherein encryption and decryption may be done either when the file is read or written). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add determining that the file is encrypted on the WebDAV server, and wherein downloading the file to a local cache comprises, communicating with the file system to create an image of the file in the local cache that is also encrypted in order to allocate a corresponding storage area for each user and store the respective user information in metadata database (see Prust, col. 7, line 59-col. 8, line 7).

22. As per claim 13, Serlet et al. and French teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 12 above, but fail to teach communicating with the file system to open the

Art Unit: 2141

image of the file such that the file system will transparently decrypt file data on read requests and will transparently encrypt file data on write requests to the file. Prust teaches communicating with the file system to open the image of the file such that the file system will transparently decrypt file data on read requests and will transparently encrypt file data on write requests to the file (see Prust, column 7, lines 39-55: wherein encryption and decryption may be done either when the file is read or written). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add communicating with the file system to open the image of the file such that the file system will transparently decrypt file data on read requests and will transparently encrypt file data on write requests to the file in order to allow the user to access the respective storage area via the many access interfaces (see Prust, col. 7, line 59-col. 8, line 7).

23. As per claim 14, Serlet et al. and French teach the mentioned limitations of claims 1 and 12 above, but fail to teach uploading the file from the local cache to the WebDAV server comprises, communicating with the file system to read data from the local image of the file such that the file will be uploaded as the encrypted image thereof. Prust teaches uploading the file from the local cache to the WebDAV server comprises, communicating with the file system to read data from the local image of the file such that the file will be uploaded as the encrypted image thereof (see Prust, column 7, lines 39-55: wherein encryption and decryption may be done either when the file is read or written). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add uploading the file from the local cache to the WebDAV server

Art Unit: 2141

comprises, communicating with the file system to read data from the local image of the file such that the file will be uploaded as the encrypted image thereof in order to prevent unauthorized users from accessing information about other users (see Prust, column 7, lines 39-55).

24. As per claim 28, Serlet et al. and French teach the mentioned limitations of claim 16 above, but fail to teach the application request comprises an I/O request directed to an encrypted file, and further comprising, automatically decrypting the data locally when downloading the encrypted file from the WebDAV server and automatically encrypting the data locally when uploading the encrypted file to the WebDAV server. However, Prust teaches the application request comprises an I/O request directed to an encrypted file, and further comprising, automatically decrypting the data locally when downloading the encrypted file from the WebDAV server and automatically encrypting the data locally when uploading the encrypted file to the WebDAV server (see Prust, column 7, lines 39-55: wherein encryption and decryption may be done either when the file is read or written). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the application request comprises an I/O request directed to an encrypted file, and further comprising, automatically decrypting the data locally when downloading the encrypted file from the WebDAV server and automatically encrypting the data locally when uploading the encrypted file to the WebDAV server in order to allocate a corresponding storage area for each user and store the respective user information in metadata database (see Prust, col. 7, line 59-col. 8, line 7).

Art Unit: 2141

25. As per claim 29, Serlet et al. and French teach the mentioned limitations of claim 16 above, but fail to teach the application request comprises an I/O request directed to a file that is encrypted on the WebDAV server, and wherein handling the request comprises, creating a local file corresponding to the I/O request and downloading an image of the file on the WebDAV server to the local file, wherein the local file is written by a local system such that the image corresponds to the encrypted image on the WebDAV server. Prust teaches the application request comprises an I/O request directed to a file that is encrypted on the WebDAV server, and wherein handling the request comprises, creating a local file corresponding to the I/O request and downloading an image of the file on the WebDAV server to the local file, wherein the local file is written by a local system such that the image corresponds to the encrypted image on the WebDAV server (see Prust, column 7, lines 39-55: wherein encryption and decryption may be done either when the file is read or written). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add the application request comprises an I/O request directed to a file that is encrypted on the WebDAV server, and wherein handling the request comprises, creating a local file corresponding to the I/O request and downloading an image of the file on the WebDAV server to the local file, wherein the local file is written by a local system such that the image corresponds to the encrypted image on the WebDAV server in order to allow the user to access the respective storage area via the many access interfaces (see Prust, col. 7, line 59-col. 8, line 7).

Art Unit: 2141

26. As per claim 30, Serlet et al. and French teach the mentioned limitations of claims 16 and 29 above, but fail to teach communicating with the file system to open the local file such that the file system will transparently decrypt file data read on read requests and will transparently encrypt file data written on write requests. Prust teaches communicating with the file system to open the local file such that the file system will transparently decrypt file data read on read requests and will transparently encrypt file data written on write requests (see Prust, column 7, lines 39-55: wherein encryption and decryption may be done either when the file is read or written). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add communicating with the file system to open the local file such that the file system will transparently decrypt file data read on read requests and will transparently encrypt file data written on write requests in order to store data files and communicate the data files to the storage server for storage within the storage area (see Prust, col.1, lines 49-67).

27. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serlet et al. (6,842,770) and Prust (6,714,968). Serlet et al. and Prust teach the limitations mentioned above in claims 16, 29, and 30 but Prust fails to teach detecting a request to close the local file, closing the local file, communicating with the file system to open the local file such that the file will not be decrypted when read and uploading the file to the WebDAV server as an encrypted file. Serlet et al. however teaches detecting a request to close the local file, closing the local file, communicating with the file system to open the local file (see Serlet et al., column 11, lines 24-49); such that the file will not be decrypted when read (see Serlet et al., column 12, lines 35-44); and uploading the file

Art Unit: 2141

to the WebDAV server as an encrypted file (see Serlet et al., column 5, line 60-column 6, line 14: wherein authenticated access functions as being encrypted). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add detecting a request to close the local file, closing the local file, communicating with the file system to open the local file such that the file will not be decrypted when read and uploading the file to the WebDAV server as an encrypted file in order to allow only the authorized user to have access to his/her data on the WebDAV server (see Serlet et al., col. 6, lines 15-23).

28. Claims 16-23, 25-27, and 32-38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serlet et al. (6,842,770) and French (6,654,794).

29. As per claim 16, Serlet et al. teaches receiving at a local programming interface layer an application request that relates to a Uniform Resource Identifier (see Serlet et al., column 4, line 54-column 5, line 2 and column 5, lines 20-52). However, Serlet et al. fails to teach a method of providing information corresponding to the request to a local WebDAV redirector; and determining at the WebDAV redirector whether a server identified via the application request comprises WebDAV-enabled server, and if so, handling the request. French teaches a method of providing information corresponding to the request to a local WebDAV redirector (see French, col. 4, lines 20-41); and determining at the WebDAV redirector whether a server identified via the application request comprises WebDAV-enabled server, and if so, handling the request (see French, col. 4, lines 42-57). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in

Art Unit: 2141

the art at the time of the invention to modify Serlet et al. to a method of providing information corresponding to the request to a local WebDAV redirector; and determining at the WebDAV redirector whether a server identified via the application request comprises WebDAV-enabled server, and if so, handling the request in order to translate the file system access request into the HTTP-compliant format and output by the client system on the data network to access the resource (see French, col. 2, lines 8-22).

30. As per claims 17-23, 25-27, and 32, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 16 stands as the motivation to further combine Serlet et al. and French.

31. As per claim 17, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claim 16, but French fails to teach a method wherein the application request includes the Universal Resource Identifier. However, Serlet et al. teaches the application request includes the Universal Resource Identifier (column 5, lines 20-52).

32. As per claim 18, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claim 16, but French fails to teach a method wherein the application request includes an identifier that has been previously mapped to at least part of the Universal Resource Identifier. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method wherein the application request includes an identifier that has been previously mapped to at least part of the Universal Resource Identifier (column 9, lines 54-63).

33. As per claim 19, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claim 16, but French fails to teach a method of providing information corresponding to the request to a local WebDAV-related mechanism comprises polling a set of at least one redirector. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method of providing information

Art Unit: 2141

corresponding to the request to a local WebDAV redirector comprises polling a set of at least one redirector (col. 6, lines 25-54: wherein status information serves the function of polling).

34. As per claim 20, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claim 16, but French fails to teach a method of providing information corresponding to the request to a local WebDAV redirector comprises polling a set of at least one network provider. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method of providing information corresponding to the request to a local WebDAV redirector comprises polling a set of at least one network provider (col. 6, lines 25-54: wherein status information serves the function of polling).

35. As per claim 21, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claim 16, but French fails to teach a method wherein the application request comprises an I/O request directed to a file, and wherein handling the request comprises creating a local file corresponding to the I/O request. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method wherein the application request comprises an I/O request directed to a file, and wherein handling the request comprises creating a local file corresponding to the I/O request (column 7, lines 35-56).

36. As per claim 22, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claims 16 and 21, but French fails to teach a method of downloading at least some file data from the WebDAV server to the local file. However, Serlet et al. teaches downloading at least some file data from the WebDAV server to the local file (column 4, lines 27-53: wherein accessing information serves as downloading file data).

Art Unit: 2141

37. As per claim 23, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claims 16 and 21, but French fails to teach a method of returning a file handle corresponding to the local file to the application. However, Serlet et al. teaches returning a file handle corresponding to the local file to the application (column 11, lines 24-49).

38. As per claim 25, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claim 16, but French fails to teach a method of determining at the WebDAV redirector whether the server identified via the application request comprises a WebDAV-enabled server includes, issuing an HTTP OPTIONS request to the server, and evaluating a corresponding response. However, Serlet et al. teaches determining at the WebDAV redirector whether the server identified via the application request comprises a WebDAV-enabled server includes, issuing an HTTP OPTIONS request to the server, and evaluating a corresponding response (column 6, line 65-column 7, line 34: wherein the request is an options request since it can be a command to write file, rename file, rename directory, etc.).

39. As per claim 26, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claims 16 and 25, but French fails to teach a method wherein the application program's request indicates a share on the WebDAV server and further comprising, issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to the share on the WebDAV server. However, Serlet et al. teaches the application program's request indicates a share on the WebDAV server and further comprising, issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to the share on the WebDAV server (column 11, lines 24-49).

Art Unit: 2141

40. As per claim 27, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claims 16, 25, and 26, but French fails to teach a method wherein the application program's request further indicates a file on the share on the WebDAV server, and further comprising, issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to the file. However, Serlet et al. teaches a method wherein the application program's request further indicates a file on the share on the WebDAV server, and further comprising, issuing a WebDAV PROPFIND request directed to the file (column 11, lines 24-49).

41. As per claim 32, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claims 16, 25, and 26, but French fails to teach a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method claim 16. However, Serlet et al. teaches a computer-readable medium having computer-executable instructions for performing the method claim 16 (column 2, line 51-column 3, line 19).

42. As per claim 33, Serlet et al. teaches a system comprising, an application program that issues WebDAV-related requests including at least one request having an identifier corresponding to a WebDAV server (see Serlet et al., column 6, lines 25-64). However Serlet et al. fails to teach a WebDAV redirector, the WebDAV redirector configured to communicate with a network server to obtain capability information thereof, and to evaluate the capability information to determine whether the network server comprises a WebDAV-enabled server; and when the capability information indicates that the network server is WebDAV-enabled, the WebDAV redirector locally handling each request corresponding to the WebDAV server that can be handled locally, and communicating with the WebDAV server to handle requests that cannot be

Art Unit: 2141

handled locally. French teaches a WebDAV redirector, the WebDAV redirector configured to communicate with a network server to obtain capability information thereof, and to evaluate the capability information to determine whether the network server comprises a WebDAV-enabled server (see French, col. 7, lines 5-15); and when the capability information indicates that the network server is WebDAV-enabled, the WebDAV redirector locally handling each request corresponding to the WebDAV server that can be handled locally, and communicating with the WebDAV server to handle requests that cannot be handled locally (see French, col. 4, lines 20-41). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Serlet et al. to a WebDAV redirector, the WebDAV redirector configured to communicate with a network server to obtain capability information thereof, and to evaluate the capability information to determine whether the network server comprises a WebDAV-enabled server; and when the capability information indicates that the network server is WebDAV-enabled, the WebDAV redirector locally handling each request corresponding to the WebDAV server that can be handled locally, and communicating with the WebDAV server to handle requests that cannot be handled locally in order to implement the two distinct resource access paths-one for local network resources and one for Internet resources in an efficient manner (see French, col. 1, lines 56-67).

43. As per claims 34, 35, and 38, the above-mentioned motivation of claim 33 stands as the motivation to further combine Serlet et al. and French.

44. As per claim 34, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claim 33, but French fails to teach a system wherein the identifier corresponding to a

Art Unit: 2141

WebDAV server issued by the application comprises a Universal Resource Identifier.

However, Serlet et al. teaches a system wherein the identifier corresponding to a WebDAV server issued by the application comprises a Universal Resource Identifier (column 5, lines 20-52).

45. As per claim 35, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claim 33, but French fails to teach a system wherein the identifier corresponding to a WebDAV server issued by the application comprises an identifier previously mapped to a share on the WebDAV server. However, Serlet et al. teaches a system wherein the identifier corresponding to a WebDAV server issued by the application comprises an identifier previously mapped to a share on the WebDAV server (column 9, lines 54-63).

46. As per claim 36, Serlet et al. teaches the above-mentioned limitations of claim 33, but fails to teach a system wherein the WebDAV redirector receives requests from the application via an application programming interface. However, French teaches a system wherein the WebDAV redirector receives requests from the application via an application programming interface (see French, col. 4, line 66-col. 5, line 19). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Serlet et al. to a system wherein the WebDAV redirector receives requests from the application via an application programming interface in order to perform its various operations and to provide the requisite functionality of its features (see French, col. 4, line 66-col. 5, line 19).

47. As per claim 37, Serlet et al. teaches the above-mentioned limitations of claim 33, but fails to teach a system wherein the WebDAV redirector receives the I/O request

Art Unit: 2141

from a manager component. However, French teaches a system wherein the WebDAV redirector receives the I/O request from a manager component (see French, col. 4, lines 58-65). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Serlet et al. to a system wherein the WebDAV redirector receives the I/O request from a manager component in order to order to perform its various operations and to provide the requisite functionality of its features (see French, col. 4, line 66-col. 5, line 19).

48. As per claim 38, Serlet et al. and French teach the above-mentioned limitations of claim 33, but French fails to teach a system that creates a local representation of the file; determines whether the file exists on the WebDAV server, and if so, downloads at least some of the data from the WebDAV server file to the local representation of the file; returns a file handle corresponding to the local representation of the file to the application program; receives I/O read and write requests associated with the file handle and handles the I/O read and write requests via the local representation of the file; and receives an I/O close request associated with the file handle, and handles the I/O close request by closing the local representation of the file and uploading at least part of the local representation of the file to the WebDAV server. However, Serlet et al. a system that: creates a local representation of the file (column 6, line 65-column 7, line 34); determines whether the file exists on the WebDAV server, and if so, downloads at least some of the data from the WebDAV server file to the local representation of the file (column 4, lines 27-53: wherein accessing information serves as downloading file data); returns a file handle corresponding to the local representation of the file to the

Art Unit: 2141

application program (column 11, lines 24-49); receives I/O read and write requests associated with the file handle and handles the I/O read and write requests via the local representation of the file (column 11, lines 24-49; column 12, lines 35-44); and receives an I/O close request associated with the file handle, and handles the I/O close request by closing the local representation of the file and uploading at least part of the local representation of the file to the WebDAV server (column 11, lines 24-49).

49. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serlet et al. (6,842,770) and French (6,654,794) as applied to claim 16 above, and further in view of Deen et al. (6,629,127). Serlet et al. and French teach the mentioned limitations of claim 16 above, but fail to teach a networking request to browse a network share on the WebDAV server, and wherein handling the request includes enumerating information of the network share. However, Deen et al. teaches a networking request to browse a network share on the WebDAV server, and wherein handling the request includes enumerating information of the network share (see Deen et al., column 16, line 48-column 17, line 15). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a networking request to browse a network share on the WebDAV server, and wherein handling the request includes enumerating information of the network share in order to carefully track the structure of the namespace and not the physical layout of the file system (see Deen et al., col. 16, line 48-col. 17, line 15).

Art Unit: 2141

50. Claims 39-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serlet et al. (6,842,770) and French (6,654,794) as applied to claims 33 and 39 above, and further in view of Prust (6,714,968).

51. As per claim 39, Serlet et al. and French et al. teach the limitations mentioned above in claims 33 and 38. Serlet et al. also teaches a system wherein requesting the file system to create a local file that is opened such that transparent encryption and decryption are not enabled therefor (see Serlet et al., column 5, line 60-column 6, line 14: wherein authenticated access may not be enabled by the user); requesting the file system to close the local file (see Serlet et al., column 11, lines 24-49). But Serlet et al. fails to teach the WebDAV file is encrypted, and wherein downloading at least some of the encrypted file data by requesting the file system to write to the local file without translation thereof. Prust however teaches the WebDAV file is encrypted (see Prust, column 7, lines 39-55: wherein encryption and decryption may be done either when the file is read or written); downloading at least some of the encrypted file data by requesting the file system to write to the local file without translation thereof (see Prust, column 7, lines 7-34). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Serlet et al. and French to a system wherein the WebDAV file is encrypted, and that creates the local representation of the file by downloading at least some of the encrypted file data by requesting the file system to write to the local file without translation thereof in order to allow an user to access virtual storage area using a conventional electronic mail software application (see Prust, column 7, lines 7-34).

Art Unit: 2141

52. As per claim 40, Serlet et al., French et al., and Prust teach the limitations mentioned above in claims 33, 38, and 39. Serlet et al. also teaches a system requesting the file system to reopen the local file (column 11, lines 24-49). But Serlet et al. fails to teach reads therefrom are decrypted and writes thereto are encrypted. Prust however teaches reads therefrom are decrypted and writes thereto are encrypted (column 7, lines 39-55). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add reads therefrom are decrypted and writes thereto are encrypted in order to allocate a corresponding storage area for each user and store the respective user information in metadata database (see Prust, col. 7, line 59-col.8, line 7).

53. As per claim 41, Serlet et al., French, and Prust teach the limitations mentioned above in claims 33, 38, 39, and 40. But French and Prust fail to teach when the WebDAV redirector handles the I/O close request, and before uploading the file, the WebDAV redirector closes the local representation of the file, and reopens the local file by requesting the file system to open the file such that reads therefrom are not decrypted. Serlet et al. however teaches a method of handling the I/O close request, and before uploading the file, closing the local representation of the file (see Serlet et al., column 11, lines 24-49), and reopening the local file by requesting the file system to open the file such that reads therefrom are not decrypted (see Serlet et al., column 5, line 60-column 6, line 14: wherein authenticated access function as being encrypted). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to add a method of handling the I/O close request, and before uploading the

Art Unit: 2141

file, closing the local representation of the file, and reopening the local file by requesting the file system to open the file such that reads therefrom are not decrypted in order for authorized users to access their data on the WebDAV server without needing to input authentication information for every transmission (see Serlet et al., col. 6, lines 15-23).

Conclusion


54. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

55. A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ranodhi Serrao whose telephone number is (571)272-7967. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00-4:30pm, M-F.

Art Unit: 2141

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Rupal Dharia can be reached on (571)272-3880. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER